

App. No. 09/698,824  
Petition dated 9/21/2005  
Reply to Final Office Action of 08/24/2005

Attn. Docket No. VELCP003

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In the Final Office Action of August 24, 2005, [3-4] Claims 1,3,5-7, 12, 14, 16-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Long USP 6,240,141; and [5] Claims and Claims 8-10, 19, and 22-23 were indicated to contain allowable subject matter if amended to include the limitations of the base and any intervening Claims. In response to the Final Office Action the Applicant requested a Telephonic Interview with the Examiner, which interview was conducted on September 13 with the Applicant and Examiner Do.

### **Interview of 9-13-05 discussing Claim 1 in view of the Long Reference**

In the interview the Applicant and Examiner discussed limitations in rejected Claim 1, in both the row transform components and the column transform components neither of which limitations singly or in combination are found in the Long reference. The Applicant and Examiner specifically discussed the following limitations found in Independent Claim 1 as follows:

“ a two-dimensional Fourier transform circuit ... having:

*row transform components ... generating partial row transforms limited to solutions to a single unsolved one of the “R” output nodes of the Radix-R butterfly on each of the “R” iterations through ... each input sample set; and*

*column transform components ... generate complete column transforms from the partial row transforms... prior to a completion of the “R” iterations through each input sample ... thereby to reduce an interval required to transform each successive input sample set.” (Applicant’s Independent Claim1, emphasis added)*

Applicant respectfully submitted that the Long reference discloses only the complete processing of all rows in a sample set before beginning column transforms. Such teaching in the Long reference is shown in FIG. 5 and FIG 10 as well as in the specification (Long at col 6, lines 35-45) The Examiner agreed that these limitations were missing in the Long reference and indicated a willingness to withdraw the Long reference. The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s reconsideration.

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.116

- 2 of 5 -